

The Republican.

No. 3, Vol. I.] LONDON, FRIDAY, SEPT. 10, 1819. [PRICE 2d.

TO THE INHABITANTS OF MANCHESTER, AND ITS VICINITY,

Who met together in St. Peter's Field on the 16th day of August last, for the purpose of discussing the best means of obtaining a Radical Reform in the House of Commons, and who escaped with their Lives from the wanton and murderous Attack made on them by that brutal armed force, called the **CHESHIRE and MANCHESTER YEOMANRY CAVALRY**.

Fellow Citizens,

ONE who witnessed your resolute, and at the same time peaceable and uniformly well-disposed conduct, at the public meeting of the 16th ult. presumes to address you on the subject of that meeting, and the murderous attack of the brutal armed force, who were sent amongst you, by those who disgrace the names of Magistrates of Manchester. To me it was a painful moment, to think that such a body of fine resolute men should have been surprised unarmed by a cowardly and ferocious armed force—cowardly murderers, that would have shrunk from fifty of you with your pikes; yet who could riotously and wantonly plunge their sabres in the bosoms of the women, because they knew the men had no weapons to protect them. The subject of this address to you, is to point out the necessity of your holding another public meeting, to pass those resolutions, and to make that appeal to the Nation, on the necessity of uniting to obtain a fair and equal representation, which was intended on the last meeting. And when I recommend this, I would also earnestly recommend, that you be prepared to act on the defensive, in case a similar attack, as was made on the last meeting, should again be attempted. I pledge myself again to make one with you, should I be at liberty at the time the meeting shall take place.

We must not be alarmed at a Grand Jury echoing the idle and frivolous charge of the Magistrates of Manchester, that to meet to discuss a question relative to our future interest

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

and welfare, is a conspiracy to subvert the laws and government of the country. We have a duty to perform to ourselves, our families, and our country; therefore, neither the fear of pains or penalties, arrests or imprisonments, nay, even death itself, should not deter us from performing that duty. If the House of Commons, in its present degraded constitution, be the Government of the Country, or part of the law of the land, then let us boast of the epithet of Conspirators, and boldly declare that our object is to subvert such a House of Commons, and to alter it into a House of the Representatives of the whole People of Great Britain and Ireland. We have no secret intentions. To make conspiracy a crime, it is necessary that some secret and malicious motive should actuate the conspirators. There is no such thing existing among us, men of Lancashire and Cheshire, but I will tell you where a criminal conspiracy does exist, and where its baneful influence has been most deeply felt. In the first place, there is a Holy Alliance, or, in other words, a Criminal Conspiracy with the Despots of Europe, to abridge and destroy the liberties of their subjects, and to make their own authority absolute.

On a smaller scale, and next in rotation, there is a Conspiracy in the Cabinet or the Administration of affairs in this country, to destroy the middle class of society, and to bring this country into the same condition as Spain at present, and France before its revolution. These are conspiracies that inflict the most deadly evils on society. The great mass of the People of this country are not only deprived of even the least shadow of liberty, but are deprived of the necessities of life, and their only means of obtaining them—a fair requital for their hard labour.—Is it not in the course of nature that you should conspire together to get rid of such evils as those? Yet you do not conspire secretly—your conspiracy is open—you openly state your grievances to the existing authorities; those authorities treat both you and your complaints with contempt; and does it not follow as an imperative necessity, that you should threaten to effect by force what you find unattainable by milder means? The necessity is not only a justification of your threatening, but of your putting that threat into execution. The Law of Nature pronounces that resolution just, and commands you to act on it. This is the case at issue between the People and the existing authorities. The powers that be, have not only by excessive taxation raised the price of the necessities of life to an extraordinary pitch, but by pressing so very hard

on the manufacturing and commercial interest have caused a diminution of wages to the labourer, in a ratio equal to the increase of the price of bread and other necessaries.

This has produced the extreme of misery. Those who have employ cannot even supply themselves and families with the necessaries of life, and those who have none are perishing daily—whilst our Rulers and their dependants are increasing their extravagancies and luxuries with the increasing hunger and misery of the people. It is from this and similar conduct, that the people have been made to feel the danger they are exposed to, and in contemplating the remedy they find nothing efficacious but the necessary controul of the democratic part of the Government over the other part. In examining that which should be the democratic part of the Government, they have found that its character and virtues have been undermined, and that it is become the mere tool of the executive and its lawless administration by the means of Borough-mongering influence. The result is, the People say to the existing authorities give us our proper controul in the legislature, by our undoubted right of expressing our voice by our representatives, the answer is—you are virtually represented—the persons whom we have delegated to be your representatives do all that we conceive to be necessary; therefore we cannot hazard the dangerous experiment of changing the system for fear of annihilating the whole. The People reply to this, saying, we are not satisfied that you should delegate persons as our representatives, we are capable of performing that office more to our own advantage, we demand it as our interest, right, and privilege so to do. The existing authorities finding no alternative but to grant the necessary reform, or support their power by a standing army, have recourse to the latter expedient, and have caused the destruction of many advocates for reform, though strictly peaceable citizens, by their military power, and if the military will consent to cut the throats of their friends and relatives, we have no alternative but to prepare to sell our lives as dear as possible; or to obtain, by the necessary means, the necessary reform.

In advising you to call another public meeting, I would earnestly recommend you to do it at the earliest time possible, after the Assizes for your county are holden, and at the same time seek some more advantageous spot for self-defence, in case of attack, than St. Peter's Field—it was, of all places, the most unfortunate for an unarmed people to be assailed by a brutal armed force. We must not shrink

from duty from the terror of a similar attack. Let every man be prepared to sell his life as dearly as possible, and I'll pledge mine that we can beat off the combined Yeomanry Cavalry of the whole country. If it is the determination of the Government to interrupt a public discussion of the necessity of Parliamentary Reform, we, knowing that such public discussion is consistent, and sanctioned by the standing laws of the country, must determine, on our part, to meet and discuss the question, even should it be at the hazard of our lives. Nothing to me can be more noble than to meet death on such ground—to sell our lives in defence of our rights, against the violation of law, and against the assault of a military despotism. But this I can say on my part, that in this country, under the present state of things, I will never attend a public meeting on any political question of Reform, without arms. Once having narrowly escaped with life is to me a sufficient justification.—I trust that I have here pointed out to you the necessity of attending that meeting with arms in your hands.

I shall next call your attention to the conduct of the Grand Juries in the Counties Palatine of Chester and Lancaster; and as the first in order I will take that of Chester. It appears that after a sermon addressed to the Grand Jury both by the Judge and Recorder at Chester, on sedition and blasphemy, the Grand Jury felt it their duty to echo back the substance of those sermons. In the first place, they parody Sidmouth's letter of thanks to the brutal Yeomanry of Cheshire and Manchester, which, by the bye, must certainly be a malicious and irreligious Libel, with a strong tendency to bring into contempt the existing order of things both in Church and State, and which, I doubt not, but the present Chief Justice, in charging the Jury, would pronounce to be a profane and seditious Libel, as every thing that proceeds from my Lord Sidmouth must be presumed to be sanctified. The next article proceeding from the Grand Jury is a parody on the sermons of the Judge and Recorder, and as the same act in this country that is an offence in a poor man is not so in the wealthy man or man of interest and influence with the Government, I shall, without the fear of an information, insert it, and endeavour to make it my text, and write a sermon upon it.

COUNTY PALATINE OF CHESTER.

"We the Grand Jury of the county palatine of Chester, at the assize holden at Chester, on the 1st day of September, 1819, feel

it incumbent at this time, to declare our indignation at the machinations of artful and itinerant demagogues, who disseminate papers of the most dangerous and seditious tendency at public meetings: with freedom in their mouths, and fraud and plunder in their hearts, employ the most inflammatory language, insidiously inculcate, under the specious veil of Reform, hatred and contempt of our Constitution, and instigate the ignorant and unwary even to exert physical force (that is, violence and open arms) for the enforcement of their visionary claims, at once useless to themselves, destructive of the rights and property of their fellow-subjects, and involving the whole country in one general ruin.

“Nor can we refrain from declaring our disgust and horror at the odious and blasphemous publications poured forth throughout the country, in which the Holy Scriptures are held up to derision, reviled, and scoffed at, and audaciously denounced to the people as false, with the malignant intention of eradicating from their minds all moral checks, and all the hopes and comforts to be desired from religion; but with the most serious and peculiar anxiety and detestation, we contemplate the unremitting exertions to poison the minds of the rising generation with the same horrid and detestable doctrines.

“We, therefore, strongly impressed with the excellence of our Constitution, protecting all ranks and degrees of society, are firmly resolved by every means in our power, to enforce the due execution of the laws against the seditious and disaffected, and against all who, either by their acts, or otherwise, endanger the public peace and safety of the realm.

“Resolved, that the declaration now produced, and unanimously adopted, be inserted in all the county papers, and in two of the London papers.

“JOHN THOMAS STANLEY, Foreman.

“Grand Jury-room,
Chester Castle, September 2.”

In the first place my beloved, the authors of my text declare their indignation at the machinations of artful itinerant demagogues, who disseminate papers of the most dangerous and seditious tendency at public meetings, &c. Now as the whole of this paragraph is ambiguous in the extreme, I have been pondering with myself to find out, who or what those demagogues are, or whence they came from, and I can find no persons in the country that will answer to the description given by the Grand Jury, but what are called the clergy—they are the only demagogues that I have ever witnessed in this country, who disseminate papers of the most dangerous and seditious tendency at public meetings; with freedom and salvation in their mouths, and fraud and plunder in their hearts; insidiously inculcating both by writing

and speaking, that the path they point out is the only road to Reform and happiness. They instigate the ignorant and unwary to throw aside their reason, and with that their moral duty, and study, by a mysterious superstition to enforce their visionary claims, at once useless to themselves, destructive to their peace and morality, and involving the whole country in one general ruin. I know not by what mischance the Grand Jury could be induced to make so insidious an attack on this privileged class. But this is not all; they have, I find, carried their malignity further, and followed up their first charge with all the force an envenomed mind could give. They charge those persons with pouring forth throughout the country the most odious and blasphemous publications. Now, this passage confirms my opinion, that this wanton attack is made on the clergy, as I know of no publication that can be considered blasphemous, but that which derogates the character of the Deity. I know of no publication that ever came under my view, that had a tendency to derogate the character of the Deity so much as that which we know to be industriously circulated by the clergy and their adherents: namely, what they call the Bible or Old Testament. And we farther know, that this class of persons decry every book as false, that is founded on truth and reason. I doubt not, my friends, but that you in conjunction with this Grand Jury contemplate with the most serious and peculiar anxiety and detestation, the unremitting exertions to poison the minds of the rising generation with the same horrid and detestable doctrines. The last paragraph of this declaration appears, though insidiously, to be levelled at the brutal Yeomanry Cavalry of that and a neighbouring county who violated the law, murdered the peaceable inhabitants and endangered the public peace and safety of the realm.

As the extinction of religion has been hinted at by this Grand Jury, it may not be premature here to make a frank and candid avowal that it is my opinion that morality would increase in ratio with the decrease of religion. I for one do boldly affirm not only my opinion, but my firm and deliberate conviction, that all and every species of religion is an imposture and fraud practised by base and designing men on the credulous part of mankind, and that such base and designing men have never hesitated to support it by force and violence whenever reason has been opposed to it. And that instead of its being necessary to propagate good morals among mankind, it is the very bane of morality and civilization,

We will now leave the Chester Grand Jury, and look after those of Lancaster, and as nothing that I can offer myself in the way of observation on their conduct can equal the description Mr. Pearson, the London Solicitor, has given of them; although it has appeared in all the newspapers of the day, yet it cannot be too often read, or too much dwelt upon; and consequently I shall here insert it.

*To Major CARTWRIGHT and S. BROOKS, Esq.
Treasurers of the Committee.*

DEAR SIRs,

THIS day the Grand Jury has been occupied chiefly with the several bills of indictment preferred before them for offences alleged to have been committed at Manchester on the 16th. The first bill which was brought under their consideration, was an indictment against Mr. James Platt, one of the Manchester Police constables, for perjury, supposed to have been committed in evidence which he gave at the examination of Mr. Hunt, Mr. Moorhouse, and others, at the New Bailey, on the 27th of August. It will be recollected that on that occasion, the principal act of conspiracy imputed to the Defendants was their presence on the hustings on the 16th, and in order to bring Mr. Moorhouse within the reach of the law, Platt deposed to having seen him upon the hustings on the occasion alluded to. The first witness on the back of the bill was Mr. Pearson, who gave in evidence, that Mr. Platt had not only sworn that he saw Mr. Moorhouse on the hustings, but upon his particular attention being called by that Gentleman to his personal appearance, assured the Magistrates of his clear conviction that he was upon the hustings at the time sworn to. Mr. Moorhouse then appeared before the Jury, and gave in evidence that he was not on the hustings on any part of the 16th; that he met the cavalcade on the approach to the Meeting; and Mr. Hunt, at about a quarter of a mile distance, seeing him inconvenienced by the pressure of the crowd, invited him to get into the carriage, which having done, he was dragged to the Meeting, and immediately on his arrival there, when within ten or twelve feet of the hustings, descended from the carriage, and taking an opposite direction, proceeded to a neighbouring public-house, and remained there till after the Meeting had broken up. Mr. Hunt and Mr. Whinson then followed, deposing to the same facts, and positively swearing that at no one time was Moorhouse on the hustings. John Collier was next examined, who proved satisfactorily that he opened the door of the carriage to admit Mr. Moorhouse, and also let him out, and that he then went away, as before described. Then followed the evidence of James Moorhouse, the Prosecutor's son, and Charles Gould, who proved that they were in situations at the Meeting which commanded a complete view of the hustings, from beginning to the end, and that on no part of the day was the Prosecutor there. Samuel Dann, Mar

Williams, and Jesse Swan, were next called, and proved that from the time Mr. Hunt came on the ground till after the dispersion of the multitude, and the destruction of the hustings, Mr. Moorhouse was in the Windmill public-house, and did not leave their sight for one minute. Similar evidence was adduced against Robert Darbyshire, jun. also one of the Police Constables; but although a Grand Jury is called upon only to decide whether a sufficient *PRIMA FACIE* case is made out to send a Defendant to take his trial, the Gentlemen thought fit to throw out the bills in question, although the same Jury, upon precisely the same testimony had found, on the previous day, a true bill against the celebrated alarmist, Richard Owen. The only difference between his case and theirs was, that Mr. Owen is only an occasional assistant to the Police, whereas the other two Gentlemen are regular practitioners, unless, indeed, it may be considered that it made a difference to the Grand Jury that before they decided upon the latter cases the bill of indictment against Mr. Hunt for a conspiracy, had been laid before them, from the back of which it appeared that the aforesaid Mr. Platt and Mr. Darbyshire were material witnesses for that prosecution, and that as their evidence could not be dispensed with, it might have been uncivil to such Gentlemen to impugn their testimony by finding a true bill against them for perjury. The next proceeding upon which the Grand Jury was engaged was that of hearing evidence on the bill of indictment against Mr. Hunt and his friends for a conspiracy. The first witness called in was the celebrated Mr. Nadin, who remained under examination about half an hour. It should be observed, that during his examination Mr. Milne, the Solicitor for the prosecution, was called into the room and remained there some little time; but, inasmuch as the attendance of a professional Gentleman upon such an occasion is irregular, it is impossible to guess his business; he, however, in violation of the universal rules of practice, brought out the bill of indictment, and strengthened his case by adding another witness to the list. Two other witnesses were then called in, but as they are not known to belong to Mr. Nadin's corps, a description of them cannot be obtained—then there following seven of the Police-runners, including the celebrated Mr. James Platt, and the renowned Mr. Darbyshire jun. and the case was closed by a Mr. Lomas, at present a stranger, and a Mr. Heifa, a decayed barber, belonging to the Society of Friends, or at least assuming the garb of that respectable body. Notwithstanding, however, the quality of the witnesses, the Grand Jury found the bill, and the evidence of Mr. Darbyshire jun., and Mr. James Platt was sufficient to fix Mr. Moorhouse as a conspirator with the rest. The Jury deliberated about 25 minutes before they called the next case.

Although five bills for maliciously cutting, had been sent into the Grand Jury on Friday morning as early as one o'clock, and the bill against Mr. Hunt and his friends did not go in till the Saturday morning, yet the Grand Jury thought fit, in defiance of ordinary usage, and a very spirited remonstrance in writing, sent in by Mr. Hunt, to let the last be first, and the first last.

The first indictment for maliciously cutting, was preferred by Mr. Gilmore, of Manchester, a respectable tradesman, who proved, that while he was at his dinner with his family, on the 10th, he heard a noise, and being informed that the Yeomanry were ordered out to disperse the multitude, went towards the ground, and having arrived at the top of the street where his house was situated, and found the people running towards him, chased by the Yeomanry, turned round, and was retiring to his house, walking on the flag stones, when, within 25 paces of his own door, one of them struck at his head with his sabre; his hat, however, protected him from the blow, but having been knocked from his head he was in the act of stooping to pick it up, when one of the gallant Yeomanry found that the opportunity of a bare-headed man, unarmed, in a defenceless position, was not to be lost, and cut him with his sword and inflicted a wound on the head. The Prosecutor's son was a witness of the transaction, and joined with his father in giving evidence on the bill. When, however, it was brought in by the Grand Jury, the Public was astonished with the sound of "Not found against Edward Tebbutt.

The next bill was against the same person, preferred by Eliz. Farren, a poor interesting looking woman, who was standing in the neighbourhood of the Meeting, with her infant child at her breast; this, however, was no protection from the rude attack of the Yeomanry. Seeing Mr. Tebbutt, one of the Yeomanry coming, she held her child down, and prayed of him to spare her infant, while, however in the act of saving her child, she received a deep sabre wound, three inches long, from the crown of her head to the top of the forehead, her child fell from her arms, and received a severe contusion on the head, of which it is at this day suffering. The woman instantly fell, from the shock of the blow, but although she was a neighbour of the GENTLEMAN who inflicted the wound, he repeated his attack, and struck at her with his sword as she was falling; the sword, however, got entangled in her clothes, and did not do her any further injury; she was soon afterwards taken home in a fainting state; but neither the sight of a gasping wound, nor the evidence of the woman, were sufficient to convince the Grand Jury, and the bill was rejected; it should be observed, that the woman deposed, that at the time she was attacked, she did not, nor does she now believe that the Riot Act had been read; and further, that there had not been any tumult, any stones thrown, or any resistance, or insult, offered to the Yeomanry, or any other persons.

The following case shared the same fate; it was an indictment against Ed. Meagher, for maliciously cutting under Lord Ellenborough's Act. Cheetham, the Prosecutor, proved, that after the Meeting had been dispersed, he was going down one of the streets in Manchester, the opposite direction to the Meeting, about a quarter of a mile from the spot, where he was met by a small party of the Yeomanry; there were two or three strangers walking the same way with the Prosecutor, when Meagher cried out, "Damn you,

disperse," to which Cheetham replied, "You stop the way, give us room, and we will be gone." Meagher then appeared to make room for passing, by riding out a yard or two from the wall, when Cheetham attempted to pass, and Meagher cried out, "Damn you, I will cut your head off," and immediately made a desperate stroke at him, which, after cutting clean off about seven inches of the rim of his hat, took effect in the neck just under the ear, and inflicted a dreadful gash three inches long and one inch deep. The person of the author of the outrage was described by the next witness, Nathan Broadbent, who gave evidence as to the activity of Meagher in dealing out his gashes indiscriminately upon all around with a blood-thirsty fury.

The next indictment, against one Thomas Shelmerdine, by a poor woman, upwards of 60 years old, who went out to the purlieus of the Meeting, to seek for a lad her son, when seeing the Yeomanry coming, she strove to make her escape, when Shelmerdine rode up to her in a furious manner; having known him from a child, she cried out, "Tom Shelmerdine, thee wilt not hurt me, I know:" deaf, however, to her supplications, he rode her down, and cut her on the head with his sabre, from the effects of which she thinks it probable she shall never recover.

The last indictment which was preferred, was against one Carlton, by a little boy, who received a most dreadful wound on the head from the sabre of this person. This lad, William Leigh, had, boy-like, attended the Meeting from curiosity, and was one of those composing a thick, compact body created by the attempts of the crowd to escape—upon the heads, shoulders, necks, and arms of these poor wretches, the Yeomanry were dealing out their cuts with a liberal hand, when the poor lad having caught the eye of Carlton, whom he knew, he ran towards him to get out of the crowd; but his acquaintance replied to his application for safety, by a blow at his head, which gave him a deep wound, full three or four inches long: the Grand Jury, however, threw out the bill. Numbers of other cases could have been preferred, but it would have been unavailing: it became evident that the Jury acted upon some fixed principle, which would have rendered all efforts to obtain redress unsuccessful. It was clear, that the rejection of the bills did not arise from what appeared on the testimony of the witnesses, nor from a disbelief of their evidence, but probably from preconceived opinions as to the reading of the Riot Act, or some other facts not then before them. Tottering old age, unsuspecting youth, manly spirit, defenceless woman, and unoffending infancy, had in vain presented themselves before the Inquests of their country seeking for redress, and sued in vain: it therefore became useless again to intrude upon their attention.

It may be observed that each of the witnesses upon all the bills, denied that to their knowledge or belief, the Riot Act had been read;—denied that any violence had been used, stones thrown, resistance presented, or insults offered—they were peaceable

Citizens and had been maliciously wounded; the Grand Jury, therefore, could not have been acquainted with any of these facts from the only legitimate sources of information, the evidence of the witnesses on each of the bills. If the Grand Jury decided upon any evidence which they received from other quarters than that of the witnesses on the respective bills, they assumed to themselves an authority the law does not recognize, and erected a tribunal to try the cases instead of exercising the powers delegated to them by the Constitution, of examining the evidence adduced for the Prosecution, and deciding as to its sufficiency to call upon the offending party to appear and answer before a Jury of his country. Whether the reading of the Riot Act can give authority to soldiers, or those who bear the name, to butcher indiscriminately, peaceable men, women, and children; whether the order of a Magistrate places those against whom it is directed out of the pale of the law's protection, and renders them liable to be hunted and massacred like wild beasts, might perhaps have furnished the armed parties with materials for the shadow of a shade of defence; but the reading of the Act, the dictum of the Magistrates, was not and could not have been legally in evidence before the Inquest—indeed, the only evidence respecting it was, that no such means had been adopted. I hope, however, that the exertions of the People to obtain something like redress for the sufferers, will never relax till the authors of their woe are brought to punishment; and that so long as the principle, that “whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed,” remains a part of the law of retributive justice. The Assizes for this county will be furnished with records of the bloody deed.

I am now convinced that there is no freedom for England till the People regain the right of electing their Sheriffs. -So long as the King's Ministers elect the Sheriffs, and the Sheriff's elect the Grand Jury, so long will the blood of the murdered cry unavenged from the ground. I am now preparing a full Report of some of the numerous dreadful cases of the wounded sufferers, which, on my return to town, will be laid before the Committee,

I am, dear Sirs, your's very truly,

Lancaster, Sept. 5, 1819.

CHARLES PEARSON.

Men of Cheshire and Lancashire, this letter needs no comment; you see now what is the force of prejudice in the minds of those who are hostile to your interests and welfare, and who will never stickle to make you a sacrifice for their own aggrandisement. You see also from this conduct of your Grand Jury, the necessity of a firm, unanimous, and resolute conduct on your part. Prepare to hold another meeting, and I trust we shall be all prepared to say, that we will have an equal and full representation, or perish in an effort to obtain it. Yours in civic affection,

R. CARLILE.

VINDICATION OF FEMALE POLITICAL INTERFERENCE.

SIR,

IN humbly addressing the Editor of the new periodical paper entitled "The Republican," I seek repose in my study from the public meeting just held in Palace Yard, (50,000 people indignant at the Manchester atrocities,) where Sir F. Burdett and Mr. Hobhouse appeared to contend, as if their retaining fees were received, *whether* the *humanity* of the Prince Regent and his progenitors (reader, remember the *tender mercies* of Culloden, North America, Corsica, Poland, Holland, Belgium, East Indies, and Parga) was most conspicuous, or the astonishing *patriotism* of the *Whigs*, not one of whom, however, had deigned to grace the meeting!

To the rising generation, then, but to the female sex in particular, do I devote an hour's research, as others have forgotten it, just to remind the world, that the interference of the lovely female sex at Manchester and other places, where they have presented the *heroine*, even at the charge of cavalry, was not so extremely novel and impertinent.

The task is not difficult, and the young men especially, will thank me for collating what they will not find in the silly, because almost exclusive, study of Grecian and Latin classics.

Requesting, then, that the student will previously store his mind by the perusal of many an eminent writer in praise of that sex, which he knows, numbers with it, and controls the *graces*, the *muses*, and the *virtues*, and that the *heroines* of the *Grecian poet* were among the striking figures of his subject, I will remind him that, when the inhabitants of the northern regions descended south, they appear to have rejected, or escaped the oriental refinements which overran Greece and Italy: and in the Saxon and Danish conquests, it seems that the *natural equality of the sexes* was preserved inviolable. So far from immuring women in seraglios, and otherwise degrading them, the northern tribes, and especially the whole of Germany, revered the female sex, as if possessed of superior intelligence, and *deliberated with them in national emergencies*. Tacitus says, they believed that their women were endowed with a divine and prophetic spirit, so that they always consulted them, and never neglected their oracular responses. De mor. Germ. Ch. VIII.

And we find that in this island, the Abbesses had seats in the Great Council, bolden 694. Saxon Chron. And also in the succeeding one, Historia Ingulphi, An. 855. And again, "Venerunt ad generalem Vocationem Abbates, Priores, *Abbatissæ*," M. Paris, An. 1210. At an ecclesiastical synod* on some important points, we find the *Abbess Hild* presiding even over the Scottish party. Bede, Hist. Eccl. III. Ch. 25. By Hicks's Thesaurus we find that women among the Saxons retained separate property, could bequeath legacies even during the life of the husband; and other women, besides Abbesses, who sat and decided in county courts ("the great seats of Saxon justice," says Blackstone) were in equal numbers with the men, and, *capital punishments were extremely rare*. After Abbots and Nobles are mentioned, the ladies follow, with many other "thanes and good wives," whose names are omitted. Vide Dissertatio Epistolaris, p. 5.

Our British establishment presents a strange inconsistency in allowing women to wield the sceptre, without being entitled to hold any subordinate situation.

We should not, however, forget that our Queen Boadicea headed our troops, and made the last great effort against Roman tyranny; or the actions of the four succeeding Scandinavian heroines; or our Elizabeth, and Anne; or those of the reigns of Elizabeth and Catharine of Russia, so tremblingly alive are women to the preservation of the human species, read this, ye Manchester savages! During their time, *not one Russian subject fell by the hand of the public executioner!*

May we not then infer from all this, that women have possessed *coequal power*? And that it materially tended to assuage the malignant and brutal passions of men? Does not every succeeding *male* parliamentary session present further acts of power, from the fountain of a more sanguinary description? Could such have been enacted, if the benevolent and compassionate female had held equal sway?

* A certain *synod* composed of the *highest dignitaries*, was held in this country, not four years ago, but veiled in *impenetrable secrecy*. It was to consider whether the divine writings and *reason* did not justify a further spiritual and pastoral consolation to mankind, *on the sublime and benignant subject of grace*. The promulgation and effect was lost 29 to 31!! This note will attract ministers of God's word of *every description*, and induce them, 'tis hoped, not only to enquire about this secret synod, but to *re-peruse* this letter, and adapt the object of it to *practical admonition*.

Little knows the historian, when he collates the facts of the American and French revolutions, if he does not give the women their due weight in those arduous contests: but for their animated influence, few young volunteers would have been found! a Bastile and rank despotism would still have existed.

But, I trust, for every useful purpose, I have sufficiently engrossed your pages: let the philosophers of our sex deliberately consider, whether, in their time, the main supporters of our infancy; the consolation of the adult; and the dernier solace under every affliction, and at the great and trying hour of death!—*have not most unjustly been degraded in their rank in society?* and whether the incalculable sufferings and distress of our dear country are not likely to be *diminished* rather than *increased*, by the confederation of that sex, which, in profane, or sacred, or modern writ, appear to have *humanized* and *refined* the age, and *decreased* our atrocities, *in equal ratio with their then standard in human society.*

I would have preferred an anonymous signature, but it is incompatible with your pledge.

S. FERRAND WADDINGTON.

London, Sept. 2nd, 1819.

From the following Correspondence it is pretty evident, that the Trials of the Informations filed against the Editor, by the late Attorney-General, will come on about the middle of October. The Information on the Theological Works of Thomas Paine will be first tried.

Lincoln's Inn, Sept. 2, 1819.

SIR,

WE are directed by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, to acquaint you, that His Grace will be in Nottinghamshire in the month of October, and that if you should require his attendance upon your trial according to the subpoena with which he has been served, you must take the trouble to enquire at Lambeth Palace, about a week previous to the day appointed, where you will obtain His Grace's exact address; and upon notice being then sent his Grace, and suitable arrangements made, His Grace will not fail to attend.

His Grace concludes that you will be aware of the great

inconvenience he must be subjected to by such a journey, and that you will not require his attendance unless it be very material.

We are, Sir,

Your obedient Servants,

FORSTER, COOKE, and FRERE.

Mr. Carlile.

Fleet Street, Sept. 4, 1819.

MY LORD,

I FEEL it my duty to express the warm approbation I felt on receiving the candid information from Messrs. Forster, Cooke, and Frere, where your Grace may be found in the month of October, should the presence of your Grace be required on my trial.

I beg to assure your Grace, that my motive in serving you with a *subpoena* was neither idle nor frivolous, and shall deem the presence of your Grace to be of the highest importance, not only to my interest as an individual, but to the interest of Truth and Justice, and, consequently, the interest of mankind in general.

In conjunction with your Grace, it is my intention to serve with a *subpoena*, the persons in this country most eminent in theology, astronomy, and oriental literature.

I further beg leave to assure your Grace, that such questions for such evidence as I may find necessary to elicit, shall be put by me with a due impression of the importance and rank of those to whom I shall be addressing myself.

I beg leave to subscribe myself,

Your Grace's

Most obliged and obedient Servant,

RICHARD CARLILE.

To his Grace

The Archbishop of Canterbury.

Fleet Street, Sept. 6, 1819.

SIR,

As the adjourned sittings in the Court of King's Bench are near at hand, I beg leave to enquire, whether it is your intention, as His Majesty's Attorney-General, to prosecute

in the ensuing sittings in the month of October, those Informations filed against me by His Majesty's late Attorney-General Sir Samuel Shepherd, and should it be your intention to proceed, which of them you will be pleased to take first.

Flattering myself that I shall find in you, Sir, a generous opponent, I would entreat the earliest notice of trial that might possibly be given, as it is my intention to serve with *subpoenas*, several persons of rank and distinction, eminent in the theological, scientific, and literary world, for whose convenience and accommodation I am solicitous to obtain the earliest notice, as many of them are resident in distant parts of the country, and would wish, at least, a week's notice for attendance.

I am, Sir,

Your most obliged and obedient Servant.

RICHARD CARLILE.

*Sir Robert Gifford, Knt.
His Majesty's Attorney General.*

SIR,

IN answer to your enquiry, I have to state, that it is certainly my intention that the Informations against you which stand for trial at the adjourned sittings in October should be tried at those sittings; and that the Information against you for publishing a blasphemous libel, which stands prior in order to the other in the list of Causes, will first come on for trial.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

R. GIFFORD.

Linc. Inn.
Sep. 7, 1819.

We had prepared a Letter to the Mayor of Exeter this week, on his illegal and arbitrary conduct towards James Tucker, but such is the press of matter at this moment, that we found our pages filled before we were aware of it: next week to a certainty. ED.

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.